SEPTEMBER 1958

MONTHLY REVIEW

N INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST MAGAZINE

AMERICAN POLICY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

THE EDITORS

IRAQ: THE NEW REGIME

HARVEY O'CONNOR

Negro Emancipation

MAURICE F. DOUGLASS

VOL. 10

5

DITORS . . . LEO HUBERMAN . . . PAUL M. SWEEZY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CONTENTS | VOLUME TEN NUMBER FIVE SEPTEMBER 1958

REVIEW OF THE MONTH: American Policy In The Middle East 161
IRAQ: THE NEW REGIME by Harvey O'Connor 171
WORLD EVENTS by Scott Nearing 180
NEGRO EMANCIPATION AND "THE WALL BETWEEN" by Maurice F. Douglass 186

MONTHLY REVIEW: Published monthly except July and August when bimonthly, and copyright, 1958, by Monthly Review, Inc. Application for second class mail privileges is pending at New York, N. Y.
EDITORIAL AND BUSINESS: 218 West 10th Street, New York 14, New York. Telephone: ORegon 5-6939.
MAILING ADDRESS: 66 Barrow Street, New York 14, New York. Address ALL communications to 66 Barrow Street.
SUBSCRIPTION PRICE: One year—$4; two years—$7. By 1st class mail—United States $6; everywhere else $7. By air mail—No. America $8; So. America $13; Europe $17; Asia $24.
EDITORS: Leo Huberman and Paul M. Sweezy.

NOTES FROM THE EDITORS

For the first time in MR Press publishing history, one large city library system has ordered 55 copies of one of our titles. The book, Anne Braden's *The Wall Between* is selling well but not nearly as well as it would if the commercial press reviewed it. The notices in the Negro press have all, without exception, been extremely favorable and word-of-mouth praise, too, is helping sales. Never before have we had so many readers volunteer to bring a book to the attention of their friends.

This does not surprise us since we felt from our first reading of the manuscript that we had a book of which MR Press could well be proud. And the comments from friends soon confirmed our opinion: from Professor Curtis D. MacDougall, Medill School of Journalism, Northwestern University, we received this note, "The book is terrific. I don't believe it's possible for anyone, no matter what his background, to read it without being deeply moved. . . ."

And from an English professor in a Southern college:

Let me commend your Press for bringing out this important contribution to racial understanding in our country at a time when most

(*continued on inside back cover*)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AMERICAN POLICY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

It is obviously impossible to analyze the Middle Eastern situation as a whole in a few pages. And yet there is not much point in trying to do less. The meaning of historical situations is never to be found in even the most painstaking examination of individual events and aspects. There is no choice but to look at the entire canvas if what is sought is understanding of the picture painted on it.

The propelling force of the Middle Eastern crisis (now and in the visible future) derives from an explosive mixture of the following ingredients: (1) Western imperialist (chiefly economic but also military-strategic) interests; (2) the bourgeois-nationalist Arab revolution; and (3) the Soviet Union's quest for national security. Let us look at these elements separately and then attempt to grasp the dynamics of their interaction.

Oil and Dollars

When American and British armed forces were sent into Lebanon and Jordan last month, the *Wall Street Journal* (July 16) blurted out in an editorial, "we are fighting for the oil fields of the Middle East." The wording is important. Neither the British nor still less the Americans are fighting for the *oil* of the Middle East. As the London *Economist* asked rhetorically a few days later (July 19), "who, after all, is in a position to buy the flood of oil which is the Arab world's greatest source of income? Not Russia." And not, it may be added, Asia or Africa—not for many, many years to come at any rate. The industrialized nations of the West are the only large-scale customers, and the Arab countries have every interest in seeing that they are well supplied.

Control of the oil fields is another thing, however. That determines not who will *buy* the oil but who will *profit* from the oil. If control passes from the great international oil companies to genuinely independent Arab countries, it won't be long, historically speaking, before the entire stream of profits will be flowing in the same direction.

The stakes are of the highest. More than two-thirds of the estimated proven crude oil reserves of the "free world" are in the Middle East. They will be yielding profits, in steadily rising amounts,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to whoever controls them for many years to come. They already provide a massive share of the profits of the capitalist world's biggest and richest industry. In 1957, the net income of the United States petroleum industry was $3,100 million, of which $2,000 million accrued to the so-called "international" companies. Of this $2,000 million, no less than $1,229 million was derived from operations outside the United States, nearly half of it based on control of the Middle Eastern fields.*

The supreme aim of Anglo-American policy in the Middle East is to hang onto and if possible strengthen control over this fabulous source of profits. Any discussion of the problem which forgets this, which argues on the assumption that London and Washington really care about anything else in that part of the world, can only confuse and mislead.

Arabia Redivivus

Everybody is now saying that Arab nationalism is the rising force in the Middle East, and it is true. What is less widely appreciated is that this is a particular kind of nationalism, a *bourgeois* and *revolutionary* nationalism. The kind of people who are leading it is well described in Harvey O'Connor's article on Iraq in this issue of MR. Educated by, and often in, the West, they are disgusted by the poverty, squalor, and corruption of their own countries. There was a time when they relied upon, or at least hoped for, Western help in modernizing their countries, a process from which they quite naturally counted on deriving the lion's share of the profits. They have long since discovered, however, that the West is concerned about modernizing the Arab world—or any other underdeveloped area for that matter—only to the extent that it may profit the giant corporations whose interests in effect constitute the national interests of the imperialist powers. As a consequence of this state of affairs, distrust and hatred of the West have become so deeply ingrained in Arab nationalist ideology that they have taken on the quality of an independent force.

The aims of the Arab nationalist movement are (1) political independence, (2) national unification of the Arabic-speaking and largely Moslem peoples who inhabit the region from the Atlantic coast of North Africa to the Persian Gulf, and (3) creation of a

* Figures from the Chase Manhattan Bank's *Annual Financial Analysis of the Petroleum Industry,* 1957. The statistics relate to 33 big companies which account for the overwhelming majority of the American industry.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

modernized economy and society. The first two are specific and, in principle, immediately attainable goals for which the means are known and ready to hand: expulsion of foreign domination, and coalescence within the framework of one or possibly two federated Arab states.

The third is more diffuse, and there is as yet no general consensus on the means to its attainment. Nevertheless, it is already clear, since economic development neither can nor will be undertaken by foreign capital and since indigenous private enterprise is wholly inadequate to the task, that the state will have to play the major role in planning, financing, and carrying through the process of economic development in the Arab lands. Disputes of the future are likely to turn less around whether the state should play this leading role than around the magnitude of the sphere to be reserved for private initiative and capital. On *this* issue Arab nationalism will doubtless increasingly divide into "state-capitalist" and socialist factions.

Soviet Interests in the Middle East

Soviet economic interests in the Middle East are limited to trade, especially arms and machinery for agricultural commodities, which is not very extensive and probably won't be for some time to come. Soviet strategic interests, on the other hand, are enormous, though almost wholly defensive.

The Middle East borders the Soviet Union on the South just as Latin America borders the United States on the South. Soviet strategic interests in the Middle East are precisely the same as United States strategic interests in Latin America. It has been a cornerstone of United States foreign policy ever since the Monroe Doctrine that the great powers should keep hands off Latin America. It cannot but be one of the overriding aims of Soviet policy to get them out of the Middle East and keep them out. In the words of Walter Lippmann:

> We can never, I think, understand the inwardness of the Middle Eastern crisis unless we recognize that what we consider the military containment of the Soviet Union, Moscow is bound to regard as a military menace to the Soviet Union. Our forces are in Turkey, of which the equivalent would be that the Red forces were in Mexico. We have the NATO alliance and the Baghdad Pact, of which the equivalent would be an anti-American Soviet military alliance consisting of Mexico, Cuba, and Central America. (*New York Herald Tribune,* July 29, 1958.)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Militarily, the Soviet Union has nothing to fear from the Arabs, everything to fear from the West. It therefore allies itself in every possible way and gives every possible encouragement to the former against the latter.

This is not to deny that the Soviet Union also has other interests in the Middle East, interests which are at once political and ideological. Quite apart from the natural desire of the Soviet leadership to help Communists all over the world, there is the extremely important fact that the ultimate success or failure of socialism, whether in the Soviet Union or elsewhere, will depend on its spreading to all or at least a large part of the world's population. The Arab countries, like other underdeveloped lands, are obviously good candidates to develop along socialist lines and eventually to join some kind of intercontinental socialist federation, and the Soviet Union has every interest in pushing them in that direction. This aim, however, is in no way incompatible with full support for bourgeois-nationalist Arab regimes such as those now in power in the United Arab Republic and Iraq. Quite the contrary. Communism and other brands of socialism (such as the Baath*) can become genuinely significant political movements only within the framework of large, politically independent, and economically developing states.

Middle Eastern Dynamics

Conceived broadly and schematically, the dynamics of the Middle Eastern situation are clear and simple. Arab nationalism is rapidly growing in strength as a political and military movement, and it is being constantly bolstered by Soviet aid and encouragement. Its enemies are the foreign regimes which still rule in a number of foreign countries and the counter-revolutionary native regimes which are holding on in others by virtue of foreign economic and military backing. The nationalist movement attacks whenever and wherever an opportunity offers, and it gains strength through struggle.

Against revolutionary Arab nationalism, the imperialist powers, seeking to hang onto their valuable economic privileges, have no weapon save force. Unfortunately for them, however, they cannot make full or even very effective use of their far superior military

* The Baath is "the socialist party of Arab revival." It has sections in all the Arab countries of the Middle East but is strongest in Syria, the most advanced among them, where its principal leaders occupy key positions in the administration of the United Arab Republic. The Communists are also strong in Syria, while both they and the Baathists are still very weak in Egypt.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

strength. For one thing, every show of force, let alone its active use, demonstrates to the whole world the true nature of imperialism. For another, as French experience has amply proved, it is extremely difficult if not impossible for modern armies to fight effectively against determined guerilla forces, and a self-confident nationalist movement can generate guerilla forces faster than they can be destroyed. Finally, with the Soviet Union backing the Arab movement the imperialists must always watch out lest they get involved in "the wrong war, at the wrong time, in the wrong place, against the wrong foe."

All of this adds up to a great irreversible historical process. There is no way to divert it from its course, no way to stabilize any of the transitional stages through which it must necessarily pass. The Arabs are entering the modern world, and they are doing so with the enthusiastic backing of their powerful neighbor to the north. The imperialist West will doubtless continue to fight rearguard actions against the inevitable, but it can call a halt in only one way, by pushing the use of force in the Middle East to the point of touching off World War III. This may happen, of course. It is the cloud under which the world will live until genuine Arabian independence is an accomplished fact. But it is not inevitable, and it is not a fruitful subject for speculation or analysis.

The Nature of American Policy

There is a widespread belief, extending even into left-wing circles, that American policy in the Middle East is dominated by the exigencies of the cold war against the Soviet Union. The United States, so the argument runs, being independent of Middle Eastern oil, has no really vital economic interests in that area. The main aims of American policy are therefore to deny the Russians access to the region and to maintain American military bases there. As Andrew Roth has expressed it in *France-Observateur* (July 31):

> There exists a fundamental difference between British and American conceptions of the policy which should be followed in the Middle East. . . . While the British are primarily concerned with their own economic interests, for the United States the dominant considerations are to pursue an "anti-Russian" policy and to assure its own strategic positions.

Now there is no need to minimize the importance of anti-Russian considerations in *any* aspect of American policy, but to imagine that they are paramount in the Middle East can only lead to dangerous illusions.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The truth is that if the primary object of the United States were to keep Russia out of the Middle East, by far the most effective method would be to withdraw armed forces from the area and to outdo the Soviet Union in encouraging Arab unity and neutrality. Adhering to the theory of the paramountcy of anti-Russian goals, one could easily conclude that it is only stupidity which prevents the United States from following this course and that another Secretary of State or another administration could easily make the change.

Nothing could be further from the truth. The United States *does* have vital economic interests in the Middle East. From the point of view of a capitalist country it is hard even to imagine a more vital interest than the present and future profits of the Middle Eastern oilfields. The primary purpose of American policy is to protect these profits, and this can be done *only* by maintaining imperialist control over the entire region, either directly or through kept native regimes. So long as this is the case, there can be no thought of outbidding the Russians in support of the Arab nationalist cause. That would mean, first and foremost, relinquishing control over the oil fields, and that in turn would be the very negation of American policy. No new Secretary of State or administration now in sight could possibly initiate so radical a change: it could come about only as a part of a vast and bitter *internal* struggle against monopoly control over the levers of government in Washington. A new New Deal at home is the very least that is required for a new policy in the Middle East.

National Schizophrenia

Meanwhile and provided World War III can be averted, American policy can only lead to one crisis after another, one failure after another, until at long last Western imperialism is literally forced out of the Middle East.

The realization that this process is already well under way is surprisingly widespread in this country. For the past two months, the American press has presented a strange spectacle. On the one hand, there have been the official pronouncements presenting the old wives' tale of indirect Russian aggression, Anglo-American response to appeals for help from the "legitimate" governments of people whose "independence" is threatened, noble plans for keeping the peace and promoting economic development, and so on and so forth *ad nauseam*. Editorial writers and pundits have, in general, hewed to the official line and done their best to give it an aura of moral exaltation. On

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the other hand—or rather in neighboring columns—a very different story has been told by reporters on the spot and columnists who take their journalistic responsibilities seriously. They have made no attempt to conceal the magnitude of the debacle which has overtaken American policy. They are under no illusions about the character of the "legitimate" governments to whose appeals the Western powers have responded, or about the kind of "independence" that is being protected. They know perfectly well that all the fancy plans for maintaining peace and fostering economic development under imperialist auspices and on imperialist terms have not the slightest chance of being accepted. They know all this, and what's more they have been saying it in no uncertain language.

Here is an illustration. In *The New York Times Magazine* of August 10th there appears a fatuous piece by Eric Johnston entitled "Formula for a Mideast Settlement" wherein we read: "Aggression has taken a new but nonetheless deadly form in the Middle East. It is indirect, usually invisible. . . . Iraq is a prime example of this indirect and murderous method." And so on. In the News of the Week section of the same day's *Times,* Homer Bigart has a dispatch datelined Baghdad, August 9. After commenting on the surprise of some observers that the Iraqi regime had not as yet denounced the Baghdad Pact or joined the United Arab Republic, Bigart proceeds as follows:

> Iraq's failure to act with haste on these supposedly burning issues has baffled the world. It becomes understandable only when one rejects the notion recently prevalent in Washington that the July 14 rising was inspired by the "indirect aggression" of the Kremlin and Nasser.
>
> Fortunately, Ambassador Robert Murphy's talks last Sunday with the revolutionary leaders may have banished this fantasy. No visitor to Baghdad can escape the conviction that this revolt was extremely popular with all elements of the population save possibly the big landowning sheikhs.
>
> This was a classic grassroots uprising against a weary, corrupt and cynical regime. . . .

Unfortunately, as Mr. Bigart must have discovered by now, the "fantasy" has not been banished. Mr. Dulles continues to talk about "indirect aggression" as the main problem of the Middle East (see, for example, his speech to the Veterans of Foreign Wars on August 18th) and threatens war if it doesn't stop—which means, in effect, if the Arabs don't give up their efforts to overthrow "weary, corrupt and cynical regimes." The truth is that such fantasies have become

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the necessary official rationalization of American policy, and no amount of factual exposure will suffice to banish them.

As a nation, the United States is rapidly working itself into a position which is certainly unusual and may be historically unique. We act one way—to defend the oil fields as long as possible; and we talk another way—about peace and justice and economic development and all the rest. So far, this is perfectly normal national behavior and would hardly call for special comment if it were the end of the matter. But we go much further. We are rapidly learning, if we don't already know, not only that the talk has nothing to do with the action but that the inevitable effect of the action is frustration, defeat, and possibly disaster. It is hard to imagine a more acute or advanced form of national schizophrenia.

Is a Rational Imperialist Policy Possible?

It is easy enough to denounce American policy in the Middle East (or almost anywhere else in the world for that matter) as a wretched failure, and a number of Democratic Senators have recently done a fairly good job of it. It is another matter to propose a better and potentially more successful policy—without at the same time giving up the basic assumption on which the international conduct of the United States has been based for well over half a century, namely, that the manifest destiny of the world is to be led by the United States of America along the paths of (capitalist) enlightenment and justice. Certainly no Democratic Senator has shown how the trick can be performed, and we have an idea that no one else will either.

Take Walter Lippmann, for example, who has been saying many very sensible things about the Middle East in recent weeks. In his column of July 29th, Lippmann outlines what he believes would be a feasible policy for the United States to follow. The core of his proposal is that the United States should seek a settlement, not with Arab nationalism as represented by Nasser and the UAR but directly with the Soviet Union. The purpose, in his own words, "would be to neutralize the Middle East as between the two great military alliances, and to build on this overall neutralization, specific agreements about the oil business, about the security of Iran, Lebanon and Israel." We take this to mean that the United States should approach the Soviet Union with an offer to exchange military neutralization of the Middle East for Soviet guarantees of Western oil interests and the continued independence of the three countries named.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Would this work? It seems most unlikely. The reason is simply that Arab nationalism will not accept a settlement imposed by the United States and the Soviet Union jointly any more than it will accept a settlement imposed by either of them separately. Sooner or later—and in historical terms it will be soon—the Arabs are going to control their own oil fields and bargain with the West about the price of oil, not about profit-sharing formulas whether they be 50-50, 25-75, or any other conceivable combination. As for Lebanon and Israel, they will eventually have to make their own accommodations with a new and enlarged UAR, possibly joining it as autonomous provinces with special constitutional guarantees for the non-Moslem religions and non-Arabic-speaking peoples. (Anyone who is inclined to find this suggestion unacceptable or fantastic should ponder carefully the likely alternatives.) The United States and the Soviet Union, along with other members of the international community, may be able to help in arriving at suitable forms and arrangements. What they cannot do, and never will be able to do, is to impose their own terms.

For all this enlightenment, Mr. Lippmann, like the old-fashioned imperialists whom he pillories in his column of July 24th, is still "living in the wrong century." From the point of view of the big powers, the Middle East is quite literally "out of control." They can adjust to this fact of life and make the best of it; what they cannot do is change it.

We may assume that the Russians are aware of this state of affairs and will therefore prudently refuse to buy any deals of the kind proposed by Lippmann. They will doubtless be glad to agree to the neutralization of the Middle East: after all, that is one of the chief desires of the Arabs themselves. But they are not likely to agree to pay for it in coin which neither they nor anyone else can deliver.

As for American policy, there are no signs of a change and no reason to assume that the Democrats would act basically differently from the Republicans. The Arab nationalists neither expect nor rely on a change. On this score, the remarks of Salah Bittar, Baathist leader and Syrian Minister of State in the United Arab Republic, are significant—and all too probably prophetic. In an interview with a French journalist, published in *France-Observateur* of August 7th, the following exchange took place:

> QUESTION: American diplomacy seems to be sensibly softening toward the UAR. Do you not believe that in the coming

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

weeks relations between the UAR and the USA may become warm and friendly?

ANSWER: I do not think so. So far the Americans have approached the problems of the Middle East solely in terms of their own strategic interests. . . . Today, I do not believe in the possibility of radical changes in American policy because experience has taught us that where the Arabs are concerned the more intelligent imperialists—those capable of discerning their true interests—have always lost out to the most conservative elements, those most attached to outdated ideas of pursuing a "policy of prestige." We have been through this experience with the French, and we now believe that the Americans, for all their camouflage, are following the same path.

It is a bitter judgment, that America is following the same imperialist path as France. But it is all too true. And it seems that the changes required inside America are no less profound than those required inside France before a new and more hopeful policy can emerge. (August 23, 1958)

Our foreign policy is inadequate, outmoded and misdirected. It is based in part on a false conception of our real, long-term national interests and in part on an erroneous appraisal of the state of the world in which we live. Worse, it reflects a dangerous apathy and a quite incomprehensible unwillingness to look facts in the face.

—Senator Fulbright, August 6, 1958

We should put off no longer a complete reconsideration and reorientation of our foreign policy. We have already waited far too long.

Time and again we have put things off. Time and again we have drifted until circumstances reached an intolerable state, and then we have rushed to the brink. This time we have even put one foot over the brink. There we dangle, waiting and wondering what will come next. We are now looking squarely into the abyss of war, a war which we do not seek and which can only have the most catastrophic consequences for all humanity.

—Senator Fulbright, August 6, 1958

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IRAQ: THE NEW REGIME

BY HARVEY O'CONNOR

The royal Iraq government that toppled on Bastille Day, 1958, took no little pride in its achievements. Washington and London basked in the assurance that this Arab satellite was stable and loyal, whatever might be said of Arabia and Jordan. The little King was kept busy in the annual Development Weeks, rushing about the Land Between the Two Rivers opening sluice gates on Tigris and Euphrates dams, cutting ribbons on bridges, turning a golden spade on building projects. Always behind the little fellow were the astute Crown Prince, Uncle Abdul Illah, and saturnine Nuri as-Said, prime minister over most of the years of Iraq's quasi-independence.

"An industrial and social revolution is taking place today in this Development State," editorialized the London *Daily Mail.* "It [Iraq] has known how to turn its wealth to social purposes," chimed in the London *Sunday Times.* "To any fancier of development programs Iraq is a model country," exulted the daily *Times* of London. The *New York Times,* echoing its London confreres, saluted the one Arab oil state that emulated Venezuela in "sowing the petroleum" in public works.

And then one dark night, when Nuri Pasha ordered the Iraq army to Jordan to join in the attack on Lebanon (with Syria the next victim?), the colonels turned on him. The little King was shot down in his palace, Uncle Abdul's body was riddled, and Nuri Pasha, betrayed in flight by pajamas showing under his woman's dress, was done to death. They had taken the fatal step of trying to use an Arab army to halt the march of the Arab states toward unity. The Baghdad Pact, at one stroke, lost Baghdad and its only Arab member.

The shocked incredulity that greeted the news of the coup d'état (or was it the beginning of a social revolution?) testified to the benumbed incomprehension that prevails in the West on Near Eastern affairs. The great journals and press associations of New York and London had given not the slightest inkling of the state of affairs in Iraq. Although the official budget figures showed that more was

---

In June, Harvey O'Connor, author of The Empire of Oil, *returned from an on-the-spot survey of conditions in the Middle East. This is the first of five articles in which he presents his findings.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

spent on police than on education, this little statistic was considered to be of slight importance. The Central Intelligence Agency, armed with hundreds of millions of dollars, voiced no warning. As a result, panic was the only reaction—and the Marines landed in Beirut the next morning. It is feared that madmen may spark World War III; isn't the danger rather from men ineffably stupid?

In self-defense the architects of the house of cards in which Western foreign policy imprisons itself may plead that Iraq looked good. Unlike the medieval absolutisms of Arabia, it did not pour its oil money into the despot's privy purse to be spent at his whim. The little King as a matter of fact was given only a paltry $200,000 a year or so for spending money (although they were building a $7 million palace for him).* Under the guidance of wise British advisers, a Development Board was set up in 1950 and given 70 percent of the state's oil revenues. The first Five Year Program (the word "plan" was avoided) had $850 million to spend; the second program ending in 1960 has $1.4 billion.

For this the Development Board can show mighty dams and bridges across the great rivers; Baghdad is no longer flooded each year; other dams are being thrown across the headwaters in the mountains. Modest beginnings have been made on other sectors—irrigation, flood control, and drainage; roads, bridges, and buildings; industry, mining, and electricity; agriculture and forestation; housing; summer resorts and tourism; and development of state lands.

While the dams and bridges are impressive engineering feats, a billion dollars seems an excessive sum for them. But Iraq has few engineers; the work had to be contracted to Western firms; even the cement often had to be shipped in from abroad. Immense waste accumulated from the sheer inexperience of a technically unequipped people. Other wastes can be attributed to the corrupt bureaucracy, to nepotism and other evils, the heavy heritage of centuries of Ottoman rule.

But the fatal flaw was not in waste, serious as that was. Rather it was the inescapable conflict between an engineer's dream and a social scientist's nightmare. The mightier the dams, the more pitiable was the unrelieved poverty of the fellahin (peasants) as they fled

* The $7 million figure appears in the Government's Development Board official publication of Law No. 54 for the year 1956. The *New York Times* of August 10, 1958, places the total projected cost of the palace at $18 million with $9 million already spent. If true, this casts a curious light on Development Board official statistics.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the land which the irrigation projects were supposed to reclaim. They poured into Baghdad, Mosul, Basra, erecting pest-holes of mud-hut cities with their bare hands, without streets, sanitation, water, lights, schools, or social amenities of any kind whatever. Aside from flood control, the great dams which are the keystones of Iraq's future had brought no benefit to most of her five million people. They proved a false facade which deceived visiting foreigners but could not alter the bitter facts of life.

Michael Ionides, British member of the Development Board and one of the world's great irrigation authorities, explained the impasse. Vast tracts of state domain lie ready to be reclaimed now that the rivers are harnessed. But it would be uneconomical for the government to reclaim them. The cost would be high; beyond that, the real obstacle was that an illiterate peasantry could not be turned loose to cope with the problems of irrigation farming. Social institutions would have to be created to help them, and that would take years. There were few technicians to furnish leadership, and no training program for farm experts. And what incentive would a government dominated by landlords have for making the peasants more independent?

The alternative? Develop the lands already in use, and increase their yield by providing water in summer. Less than half of Iraq's arable land is cultivated, and half of this lies fallow each year under a system inherited, along with farm techniques, from Babylonian times. Once the granary of the Near East, Iraq today imports a good bit of its wheat.

But increasing the yield from the land already farmed would provide the social scientist's nightmare. The land in use is owned by the sheiks or controlled by townsmen who own the pumps. This is recent. Before the British came during World War I, the land was held in tribal ownership. The British, as in India in the 18th century, needed a base of support for their rule, so gradually the sheiks were vested with private ownership of tribal lands in exchange for their fealty. As private owners they continued the sharecropping of tribal days, so the fellahin got no wages. The sheik controlled the seeds, whatever equipment rose above the level of a hoe or primitive plow, the marketing of the crops. A quarter or so of the crop was returned to the fellahin for subsistence. If they fell behind, they could get loans from the sheik and sink into peonage. Since the country's quasi-independence, the Baghdad oligarchy has continued the process of alienating the land from the tribes and fellahin and vesting it in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the sheiks and landlords. The sheiks in turn cast the votes of the fellahin for themselves and thus constituted the majority in the Chamber of Deputies. They moved to Baghdad, built villas, bought Cadillacs, and strolled the streets in their silken robes of the desert with silken headgear bound by golden cords, golden daggers in their belts. On this rotten social foundation, the royal regime collapsed on Bastille Day, 1958.

The Development Board, creature of the Chamber of Deputies, was unable to tackle the real problem of Iraq, the social development of agriculture. The fellahin cursed the dams as they fled to the cities to erect the mud huts in which their babies die like flies, and to get casual work at 75 cents a day, a small sum but more than they could ever hope for from the sheik. The Board did gnaw at fringes of the problem. The Dujailah project vested state lands in peasants, but collapsed from bureaucratic ineptitude, corruption, and lack of technical aid for the peasants. Irrigation projects, land reclamation, draining the salt from ruined land, all worked only to enrich the sheiks and other landlords while intensifying the growing misery.

The new government in Baghdad represents a substantial break with the rotten past. Its power for the moment rests on the bayonets of the Army, for in a state where the upper class is corrupt, the middle class small, and the working class and peasantry mostly illiterate, power goes to the guns for the time being. The role of the Army in such states depends on its composition. As the ruling class sinks into indolence and self-gratification, it forgets to staff the Army with its sons. A new type of officer arises from the war colleges, sons mostly of the middle class, seeking a career in one of the few professions an underdeveloped society offers. These middle-class officers have a tendency to revolt against the abject surrender of power by the native elite to a foreign occupying force, against the dismal future their relatives face in trying to do business under the extortions and peculations of the governmental bureaucracy. After a hundred forced marches to put down revolts among the tribes, the fellahin, the industrial workers, they feel a revulsion against the dirty work heaped upon men who consider themselves the custodians of the nation's glory. The results are on history's pages in Latin America, in Egypt, in Syria. The "colonels," not the generals, lead the coup d'état. If there are adequate forces among the professional and business people, the students and intelligentsia, the workers, an alliance may be formed which promises social progress. The promise is subject to the self-restraint and social consciousness, or lack of them, of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the controllers of the machine guns, and to the level of political development of their emerging allies among the civilian population. This is the situation in Baghdad today. It would be rash to predict stable progress toward basic social reform. The problems are so great. Consider a few of them:

Illiteracy. The nation is 85 to 90 per cent illiterate. At the end of the Ottoman regime only 6,000 were in school; the official figure now is around 250,000 but the fact is that even in Baghdad, middle-class parents queue up for months in an effort, often vain, to get a seat for their child in the next school term. The schools have a bookish curriculum; college students go in mostly for law and other prestige professions; there is little work practice connected with technical training and engineering; white-collar, city jobs are preferred. Typical of this trend are the figures on doctors: in the entire country there are 980 physicians and surgeons (one to every 5,000 people); of these, 620 practice in Baghdad; of these, 340 have their offices on Rashid Street, the main stem.

So, even if the new government were manned by socialistic angels, all their good intentions would have to work through millions of untrained hands, willing but still largely impotent. The Development Board, when it ventured half-heartedly into social projects, found bureaucratic incompetence and corruption joined with technical inexperience a hard combination to beat.

Health. The *Statistical Abstract* gives dysentery as the main disease with acute ophthalmia (trachoma) second. Marasmus (wasting due to malnutrition) is the leading cause of infant deaths, followed by diarrhea and pneumonia. There are no reliable vital statistics since most of the 8,000 villages have no doctors or anyone equipped to note the facts, much less do anything about them. This does not prevent well-meaning foreign missions from setting up dietetic clinics, much to the amazement of Iraq observers. The swamp tribes in the south live one step ahead of the Australian aborigines; the bedouins (desert dwellers) are wretched victims of eternal malnutrition. A people illiterate, diseased, and hungry faces any government with a formidable problem; small wonder that Ionides and other well-intentioned government officials were content to think in terms of generations. The present Iraqi however, when articulate, can state quite clearly that they wish to live now.

With a government freed of landlord influences, there is really no insuperable reason why the people of Iraq cannot have an immediate, appreciable increase in their standard of living. The country is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by no means poor. As an oil producer it ranks about sixth among the nations of the earth; last year the government's revenue from oil was around $150 million, which figures out at $30 per capita. In addition Iraq Petroleum, the British-American-French-Dutch firm that has a monopoly of production, made at least that much from production within Iraq, not to count the profits on transportation and marketing. Iraq is by all odds the leading date-exporting country: the river banks from Baghdad down to Basra and the Shatt al-Arab are lined with 30 million of the graceful palms. Along the canals of the palm groves around Basra, even the mud huts seem not too bad in this modern Garden of Eden, however inhospitable the saffron-red deserts of Mesopotamia may be as they await eventual conversion to fertility from the waters of the Euphrates and Tigris. In Babylonian times it is said that 20 million or more people lived in this land which now fails to support even one quarter that number.

The new government in Baghdad is composed of men for the most part devoted, highly intelligent, and ranging in views from liberal-democratic to socialistic in the British Laborite sense. Rather typical are Mohammed Hadid, former vice president of the National Democratic Party, a factory owner, now Minister of Finance, and Fayek Samurrai, now Ambassador to Cairo, the nation's most important diplomatic post. Both are wealthy men, one has spent time in prison and domestic exile, both when interviewed in Baghdad several months ago expressed themselves with complete frankness, well knowing that their personal liberty hung by a hair.

Of such men, the core of the new government, it can be said that they are nationalist, i.e., patriotic; that they are internationalist, i.e., supporters of Arab unity and of the United Nations; that they are not anti-Western in the sense of being hostile to the peoples of the West, although to a man they are bitter about Dulles, Macmillan, and the French rulers; that they are not pro-Eastern in the sense that they follow a Soviet line, rather they see in Russia and China nations which have faced the same staggering development problems as their own and are coping with them in a meaningful way. As good bourgeois, they want Iraq to develop in its own capitalistic way, a kind of welfare state with strong government influence in industry because of the nation's backwardness. In this general attitude, they are strikingly similar to the Egyptians.

In one way, the new government is in a happy position; it need bend the knee to no foreign nation as a beggar. So long as the oil flows, Iraq is assured an income of at least $150 million a year plus

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

its other revenues, adequate to finance both the government and the Development Board. Liberal elements who clamor for American or UN funds to aid underdeveloped countries will not find the Iraq government in line, cup in hand, for a dole. Actually what it asks of the West is to get off its back. The State Department, acknowledging that Iraq is a British preserve, has concentrated on Turkey, Israel, and Iran in handing out funds; the British, on the other hand, have concentrated on extracting as much as possible from the Mesopotamian oil fields. Iraq can use plenty of technical assistance, for which it can pay, in order to train its own people. The little American money that did go into Iraq under the old regime earned scant praise. An educational mission sent to the Dujailah project wasted thousands of dollars and four years' time because the Baghdad functionaries saw no profit in it for themselves, and declined to cooperate.

The new government, on the international front, will cooperate, it seems obvious, with the United Arab Republic. If it seems feasible, Iraq may either join the UAR as a province, or as a separate unit as Yemen did; even if not, the ties that bind it to Cairo and Damascus will be tight and cordial, for the feeling of Arabism is the most powerful in the Near East. Iraq will be a loyal member of the Africa-Asia bloc in the UN. Its relations with Britain and the United States will be correct, but the people in the new cabinet have little reason to waste affection on either the State Department or the Foreign Office, which appeared so eager to invade Iraq after the coup d'état until they found they had no quislings with whom to cooperate.

As usual, the toughest foreign problem will be Iraq's relations with the Iraq Petroleum Company, a firm which has made billions from Iraq but which nevertheless is owned by British Petroleum, Royal Dutch/Shell, Standard of New Jersey, Socony, and the Cie. Française du Petrole. Every Iraq government has had trouble with IPC. For years the nation got a negligible return; only after Saudi Arabia got a 50-50 deal from Aramco was Iraq able to force IPC into a similar formula. The 50-50 deal is something of a misnomer. Iraq does not share half of IPC's profits, but only a half of those profits made in production. Actually, as in the other Near Eastern countries, 50-50 means more a 65-35 deal with the companies on the long end. Even the old regime had plenty of disputes on how IPC calculated its production costs, insisting that exploration and drilling were capital expenses, not to be deducted in calculating the 50-50 split. IPC claims that when it makes gifts they must be deductible,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

so that its generosity is also on a 50-50 basis, with the government paying half whether it wants to or not. There seems, too, to be a good bit of mystery about production costs, profits, and all aspects of IPC finances; and it is claimed that outsiders can form an estimate only from the annual report of Standard of New Jersey, which has an eighth share in IPC.

The new regime is not in too enviable a bargaining position. The international petroleum cartel, through vastly increased production, can now suffer the complete shutdown of any one country for a time. Tiny Kuwait, for instance, can supply all of western Europe's needs by itself if valves on all its wells are opened. For the time being, too, the cartel can count on Iran, a non-Arab country, as an ally if a dispute with Iraq means that Iranian production would be increased.

Iraq alone of all the oil states finds itself burdened with a monopoly oil concession. The British saw to it that all the nation's soil was preempted by Iraq Petroleum and its subsidiaries, the Mosul and Basra units, leaving only a narrow offshore oil slice under national control. That of course was an oversight; at the time of the concessions offshore drilling techniques had not been perfected. So while Iran, Arabia, and Kuwait continue to negotiate juicy new agreements for segments of their land, Iraq finds she has nothing left. Even Nuri Pasha, in his last days, was complaining about that!

The answer to these liabilities in Iraq's position seems to lie in a common Arab League oil policy. The old regime torpedoed a proposed Arab oil policy committee conference last year; perhaps now if Arabia and Kuwait join in a common program with Iraq, a united front can be poised against the cartel.

It has been frustrating for the Iraqi to watch their oil being piped away to be refined in foreign lands. Some of the refining could be done at home, they insist. Just as important, oil should be processed in Iraq to create a new petrochemical industry, to furnish a wide range of plastics, synthetic rubber, fertilizers, and other products for export as well as domestic use. The gas from the Kirkuk, Mosul, and Basra fields is now flared to the air; here too is a potent source for making carbon black and for firing industrial boilers as well as for home use.

Under the present agreement, 12.5 per cent of Iraq production is royalty oil, to be sold by the government. Yet so complete is the cartel's command of world markets that Iraq has never yet been able to sell its royalty oil except to IPC, at the usual terms. Even more

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

frustrating is the agreement which provides that the products from the government's own refinery near Baghdad can be sold only within the country. Incidentally, IPC supplies crude for this new refinery at cost of production, which is about 82c a ton, or 11c a barrel. The same oil sells at the Levant terminals at $2.69 a barrel. Has money ever been made so magically since King Midas lost his touch!

However the new regime may adjust itself to IPC, the problem of a state within a state will remain, a foreign body inflaming its host. Perhaps, as the 50-50 pattern falls to pieces in the near future, Iraq can attain joint ownership and a share in management against the time when it can claim its oil for its own.

In domestic policy, the new government's greatest challenge must lie in a massive crash program to train thousands of farm leaders and technicians to help the peasants open up the state lands which now lie ready for irrigation and drainage. Allied with that may come a campaign to reclaim the tribal lands given away to the sheiks and to farm them cooperatively. This may involve too dangerous a political problem for a new and yet untried government. If the state domain were developed, even at higher cost, the same result would eventually be achieved, the wilier say, because the fellahin would desert the sheiks' lands for government land, leaving the sheiks with land but no labor. An obvious device, too, is the imposition of a land tax. Landlord control so far has prevented any taxation whatever of farm lands. And the income tax accounts for only 3.3 percent of the government's revenues.

In any event the new regime need not lack for plans and surveys. These have been a main industry for the Development Board, and the supply of pigeonholes has been the only bottleneck here. What is to be done is well surveyed; who is to do it confronts the government with its biggest worry—the education and training of a people in double-quick time.

It will be a near-miracle if the new government should last for several years. The short turbulent history of this proud but blighted Arab nation is filled with coups d'état, with incessant struggle against foreign and domestic usurpers. The visitor in Baghdad but a short six months ago was depressed by the appalling poverty, the brutality of the dictatorship, the all-too-evident helplessness of the feeble opposition. But look what happened! Perhaps a miracle is at hand, perhaps Iraq faces a future as noble as its past when Baghdad was the world's cultural capital.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WORLD EVENTS

By Scott Nearing

Paratrooper Diplomacy

Through the centuries, on one pretext or another, strong nations have crossed the frontiers and occupied the territory of their weaker neighbors. Ordinarily such invasions have led to local fighting, and sometimes to major wars. The mid-July occupation of Lebanon, Jordan, Turkey, and the waters of the Eastern Mediterranean by United States and British armed forces is only the latest in a long series of such episodes.

Political domination and economic and military occupation of smaller, weaker countries by major powers are highly unpopular, especially in territories that have been invaded and occupied recently. Since 1945 the unpopularity of aggression and intervention has led to a continuing series of political coups and armed revolts centering increasingly about the Middle East.

Middle East unrest, increasing during recent years, has caused growing concern to the British and French who ran into such strenuous opposition that both governments were forced to grant a measure of self determination to native Middle East ruling elements. The rapid growth in the demand for oil and the discovery that the Middle East contained the earth's largest known oil reserves has led to renewed efforts by the Western powers to re-establish themselves in the area. This aggressive drive was led by United States interests. (See *The Empire of Oil,* Harvey O'Connor, Monthly Review Press, 1956.)

Earlier invasions and military occupations of the Middle East were spearheaded by foot soldiers, sometimes aided from the sea. Then came the era of gunboat diplomacy, when warships enforced the demands. Today paratroopers are flown from ship decks, from adjacent bases in Europe, or straight across the Atlantic Ocean, to impose the will of the master nations on their vassals and dependents. Earlier invasions were slow and cumbersome. Today defenseless countries can be occupied by ship or land-based paratroopers within a matter of hours. If the peoples of the world accept the principle and practice of paratrooper diplomacy, they yield both independence and sovereignty to the handful of nations that have the wealth and equipment needed by an effective striking force of paratroopers.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Truman-Eisenhower Doctrine in Action

Immediately after the 1939-1945 war, President Truman announced that Greece and Turkey were under United States protection and therefore out of bounds for Communists and communism. Later the "defense perimeter" of United States interests was enlarged to include Korea, Viet Nam, Formosa. Now it has been extended to the Middle East, with its fabulous petroleum fields and its strategic location at the junction point of three continents. Territorial waters have a limit of three miles beyond the coastline, but under Truman-Eisenhower theory and practice, the interests of one nation (the United States) may extend to the four corners of the earth. Washington determines when and where United States interests are threatened, and Washington moves into the theatre of trouble such military forces as are needed, (in its judgment) to protect United States interests.

In its earlier forms the Truman-Eisenhower doctrine was camouflaged as an answer to Communist aggression. As applied to Lebanon it is an attempt to stabilize the status quo by rescuing established governments which are endangered from within or from without. Such governments will be backed by Washington, in defense of "American interests." Says the *Wall Street Journal* in an editorial (July 28, 1958), "The political expansion of our military involvement represented by Lebanon is . . . global. If called upon, are we to rush troops to the defense of any government anywhere that feels itself threatened from any source or for any reason? This is a curious position for a nation that came into being by armed uprising against a legally constituted government. It is one thing to try to grapple with the extremely difficult problem of Communist subversion, but it is quite another to try to protect any and all governments simply because they are governments."

Western policy-makers, originators and promoters of the Cold War, had built up a "Communist Menace" to justify their planet-wide drive for resources, markets and military bases, and to head off and reverse the move for Asian-African independence and self-determination. The invasion of the Middle East was one in a series of events which began during the 1939-1945 war and extended from Indonesia through Indo-China, Malaya, Korea, and North Africa, to Suez and Lebanon.

The Middle East is not communist. Its dominant motive is Pan-Arabism combined with a mass movement to abolish feudal rem-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nants and poverty, advance education, improve health, and organize planned economies. The invasion helped to shift the axis of the Cold War, which had been capitalist versus communist: the Soviet Union versus the remnants of Western imperialism. Under the new conditions created by the invasion, the Soviet Union was in the picture only incidentally, as a friend and exemplar of independence and self-determination. The new confrontation was NATO versus the Arab people and Pan-Arabism. Having plunged into this mid-Eastern hornet nest, Washington and London are faced, not with a war against communism and the Soviet Union, but, if the occupation continues, with the probability of another guerrilla conflict such as those in Indo-China, Malaya, and Algeria.

What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. This principle of world-wide military intervention by one nation whenever it believes its interests to be threatened can be offered as justification for a parallel policy of intervention, invasion, and military occupation, by any nation, any time, anywhere.

Bolshies in Mexico?

Let us suppose that a progressive regime, duly elected and installed in Brazil, Nicaragua, or Mexico, were threatened by a revolutionary movement, equipped and armed with USA private or public dollars. When this situation developed in Guatemala it was treated as a "domestic" affair, the duly elected Guatemalan government was overthrown, and the new government immediately recognized by Washington.

With the Truman-Eisenhower doctrine as a precedent, a different procedure might be followed in the future. The progressive government, located perhaps in Mexico City, might appeal to Moscow for aid against an international capitalist conspiracy. Moscow, which has plenty of transport planes and paratroopers, might air-lift them to Mexico City in an attempt to protect the Soviet national interest and world peace, and to preserve the independence and integrity of the nations of Latin America (paraphrased from President Eisenhower's radio and television statement of July 16, 1958). The Soviet paratroopers might land near Mexico City, take over the air field, occupy the capital, and make proper disposition of their sea, land, and air forces along the southwest frontier of the United States.

And then? Would there be a long wrangle about a summit conference and a United Nations police action, or would United States air, sea, and land armies unite in "operation safeguard" and exter-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

minate the Communist marauders?

Before time runs out on us, would it not be wise to reverse the Dulles-Eisenhower doctrine, under which the armies of one nation may occupy foreign territory? The Cold War, with its armament race; the military occupation of foreign territory; the political paralysis which prevents the big powers coming to grips even superficially with disarmament; and the endless palaver of the past weeks about a meeting of chiefs of state, point up one of the gravest problems facing present-day humanity—the absence of any duly constituted planet-wide authority with sufficient delegated power to ensure equal justice under law.

China Is New

Our swashbuckling contemporary, *Newsweek,* in its July 14, 1958 issue, printed an eye-witness story from People's China. We quote part of the first paragraph. "The burnished temples of imperial Peking glittered in the pale sunlight of a recent Sunday afternoon. Chinese parents herded their saucer-eyed children through the palaces of the Forbidden City and along the shores of the North Lake where, in another century, the Empress Dowager lavished China's naval budget on the building of a marble ship. Old men with wispy white beards took their pet crickets out for an airing, and the China Opera House featured such staples as 'Wu-sung Fights the Tiger' and 'The Golden Tortoise.' But beneath the ancient city's timeless facade, Peking clearly bore the grim imprint of the new 'People's China,' where nine years of Communist rule have almost obliterated more than 30 centuries of Chinese civilization."

There is some truth in this description. The rule of the Dowager Empress has been replaced by a republic. The Forbidden City is a public park. The streets of Peking, which were littered with refuse and crowded with beggars before 1949 are now clean and beggarless. Rags have been replaced by whole clothing. The water supply is clean and adequate. Cholera, smallpox, and other plagues have disappeared. Chinese women who were part serf and part beasts of burden under the old regime are the economic, political, and social equals of men. Nearly 70 million children and young people are in schools, and the young folks themselves are among the sturdiest, healthiest, and most improvement-conscious to be found anywhere. The old order in China is rapidly yielding place to a new one. The Chinese people, liberated from Chinese overlords and imperialist exploiters, are building a planned, cooperative, socialist society.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Newsweek is right. Thirty centuries of poverty, ignorance, disease, disorder, and ruthless exploitation are being replaced by an era of Chinese (and ultimately of Asian) socialism.

Peace and International Cooperation

Peace and international cooperation were the twin slogans of a Disarmament Congress which assembled in Stockholm, Sweden, on July 16, 1958. Seventy-eight nations were represented at the Congress by 1,260 delegates and observers.

As the Congress met, destiny decreed that United States marines and armed forces from Great Britain should move into Lebanon and Jordan, occupy air fields, and make themselves at home. Had the conveners of the Stockholm Congress retained the best advertising brains on Madison Avenue, had they been able to spend unlimited sums on promotion, they could not have devised a more perfect justification of their demands for disarmament and international cooperation.

United States-British occupation of the Middle East in the face of Soviet protest and warning demonstrated the war danger. Since the invading forces were equipped with atomic and nuclear weapons, the occupation also highlighted the probability that new mass-destruction weapons would be used at the outset, if hostilities were begun. Peace-minded people reacted against this aggression in favor of disarmament and United Nations intervention.

These negative results of Western military occupation of the Middle East were followed by significant positive consequences at this Congress. Almost every country of Asia and a large part of Africa, together with most of Europe, were represented at the Stockholm Congress. In Asia, Africa, and Europe there are pressures and tensions of undetermined magnitude. The conveners of the Congress had no advance assurance that these pressures and tensions could be successfully contained within the framework of Congress procedure. The military occupation of the Middle East swept differences off the Congress floor into the lobbies. On its first day the Congress members, by acclamation, rose and shouted their approval of a resolution condemning aggression in the Middle East and demanding withdrawal of Western troops. The episode unified the Congress and guaranteed its success.

There were further positive consequences of this move of the West to retain its hold on Asia-Africa. Invasion from the West not only unified Asia, Africa, and East Europe, all vitally concerned be-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cause of their geographical location, but it gave priority, throughout the Congress, to Asian-African-East-European concerns. Thus the independence and self-determination movement which was sweeping Asia, Africa, and East Europe became identified with the movement for peace and international cooperation represented by the Stockholm Congress.

Throughout the non-Western world there is a growing conviction that independence, self-determination, and the building of socialism depend upon the maintenance of peace. This point of view is not "pacifist" in the ideological sense of that word. As the non-Western world sees it, peace and international cooperation are the necessary pre-conditions of their happiness and well-being, and perhaps of their survival.

As the Stockholm Conference drew to a close, after a week of discussion and consultation, three positive proposals emerged. First, active support of the Japanese August Conference Against A and H Bombs as the first in a series of regional conferences for disarmament and lasting peace. Second, the organization of regional conferences in South Asia, Africa, Latin America, and Europe, to coordinate the peace movement. Third, intensified efforts in all 78 countries represented at Stockholm to take the issue to the people and build up a planet-wide movement for disarmament, international cooperation, and peace.

Anyone wishing detailed information about the work of the World Council of Peace, which organized the Stockholm Congress, can secure it by writing to the International Institute for Peace, 5 Mollwaldplatz, Vienna IV, Austria.

Epitaph

Last stronghold of private enterprise economy, shepherding the shattered remnants of 19th century imperialism, sanctuary of reactionaries from three continents, treasure house of world counter-revolution, the United States with its ruling Oligarchy of big business and military interests, is living beyond its means, plunging deeper and deeper into debt, and financing its mad escapade with I.O.U.'s. Harried by debt and surrounded by enemies who are communists and allies who are anti-American, the self-proclaimed leader of the Free World seems likely to end its career under a headstone bearing the inscription: Here lies a spendthrift and bomb-toting madman who perished with this obscenity on his lips: "Buy! Buy now! Buy something! Buy anything!"

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEGRO EMANCIPATION AND "THE WALL BETWEEN"

BY MAURICE F. DOUGLASS

The well-known case of Andrew Wade's courageous but unsuccessful effort to secure a decent home in a suburban section of Louisville, Kentucky, has now been told in Anne Braden's *The Wall Between* (New York, Monthly Review Press, $5.00). Besides being one of the truly important human documents of our time, Anne Braden's excellent and very readable account of the Wade case points up a number of important issues which are significant to the Negro's persistent struggle for complete emancipation. Several of these issues will be considered in this article by way of passing Anne Braden's book in review.

I

American capitalist democracy has taken great pride in its apparent dedication to the intrinsic dignity of each human being. Yet capitalist America, from the beginning, has treated the Negro with utmost brutality, disrespect, and utter degradation. The paradox of it all is so vividly seen in the fact that when the Founding Fathers were coining the classic words of the Declaration of Independence—that "all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness"—the Negro was being held in degrading bondage, and at that very moment thousands of other Negroes were being brought forcibly to these shores of liberty for a life of degradation unknown to them in Africa.

One might, of course, justifiably argue that the ideas expressed in the Declaration of Independence were sincerely held by the founders of American society, and that *in time* they were expected to be secured in reality. However, the very capitalist order for whose control the founders fought the British contained within itself the conditions that would preclude the realization of the ideas laid down

Maurice F. Douglass is the pen name of a Negro graduate student at a large American university.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the Declaration. The capitalist order, by its very nature, respected the dignity of neither the white masses nor the Negro masses. It considered both as mere objects of capitalist production and profit. It was on the backs and the blood, sweat, and tears of both that capitalism and the class which dominated it were to rise, roughshod, to untold power.

There is no doubt about the Negro's share in the burden of building capitalist America, but he has received a much smaller share of the benefits that capitalism has permitted to flow to the American working people at large. If one accepts the view of many social scientists that Ameirca has reached the millennium, then one might care to argue that "Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness" belong to the majority of white Americans. But even the most avid apologist of capitalist America would, I suspect, hesitate to argue that most Negroes even approximate the enjoyment of such an existence. Among the innumerable proofs of this damning fact, the shameful ordeal of Andrew Wade and his family is outstanding.

II

To the racists in the American southlands, the crime of this Negro electrician was not merely his desire for a decent house and environment for his wife and child, but also his willingness to secure such in a suburban neighborhood preserved for "whites only." Even more, Wade sought to secure a house with the courageous assistance of a white Southern family. For only through such assistance could a Negro ever obtain ownership of a house outside the areas to which Negroes are forcibly confined.

When the news broke of Anne and Carl Braden's transfer of a house in a white section of Louisville to a Negro family, the predictable hatred of the racists erupted in all its bitterness. Also the so-called moderate or liberal elements in Louisville expressed their opposition to this direct attack upon the racist order in the American South. Like American liberals generally, these Southern liberals cling religiously to the view that one should not rock the boat too much, no matter how thoroughly discredited, rotten, and inhuman the boat may be. Speaking through their organ, the *Courier-Journal,* the liberals of Louisville were quick to condemn the Bradens for rocking the boat:

> The real fault of judgment . . . lies with Mr. and Mrs. Carl Braden. This white couple bought the Shively house in their

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> own name, with no intention of living in it, but for the sole purpose of getting it into the hands of Negro owners who could not have bought it directly. Whatever may have been the motives of the Bradens, we believe they gave poor service to idealism in forcing an issue of race relations in this artificial and contrived way.

Anne Braden relates the liberal reaction to the Wade case with great objectivity (too much so for this reviewer), and what she tells us provides much insight into the liberal approach to radical and social injustices in capitalist America. When confronting the racial and social evils of capitalist America, the liberals (North and South) will invariably prescribe pills when nothing short of surgery is required. It is this approach which is "artificial," and which is inherent in the split-mindedness liberals display regarding the nature of capitalist America. On the one hand they worship capitalism and the middle-class and professional status it has afforded them, while on the other hand they recognize its "weaknesses" and endeavor to offer an intellectual dedication to racial and social reform. In a word, the liberals want capitalism but none of its evils; they want, in effect, the impossible. Yet there is something one can say for the liberal approach to Negro emancipation: half-hearted activity on behalf of the cause is better than no activity at all. Or, as Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois has put it: "[Liberals] mean well and usually that is about all they mean. . . . The good intentions which pave Hell are better than no pavement at all."

Beyond their good intentions, there is little to be said for the liberal approach to Negro emancipation. For something more than liberalism is needed to rid American society of the conditions that have relegated the Negro to oppression and degradation, poverty and ignorance, for the past three centuries. Unfortunately, Anne Braden never gets to indicating any serious alternative to liberalism, beyond the suggestion that a change of attitude among whites towards Negroes is basic to a new race relations in the South. I can hardly disagree with this, but I consider it only a minor start which could take another century to produce a new race relations and with it Negro emancipation.

It is no longer possible, in my opinion, to shun the fact that what is needed is nothing short of a socialist orientation to the question of Negro emancipation. I do not expect white liberals to reach this conclusion in my lifetime, but I do think the facts of the Negro's status should produce some new thinking among the liberals that

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

make up Negro leadership in this country. They too, of course, take great pride in the middle-class status capitalist America has afforded them. But the continued degradation and impoverishment of the Negro masses helps maintain some element of realism in the thinking of the liberal-oriented Negro leadership. At the recent Convention of the NAACP its Labor Secretary, Mr. Herbert Hill, informed the Convention of the still impoverished status of the Negro masses, despite nearly eighteen years of war-centered prosperity:

> In 1939 the typical Negro worker earned an average of $364 a year. The white worker in that year earned $956—that is, two and one-half times as much. By 1954 the average wage or salary income of a Negro had risen to $1,589, while the average white worker earned $3,174. . . . In 1954, 17.6 percent of all white families in the United States were living on an annual income of $2,000 or less, but of non-white families 43.3 per cent were living on an annual income below $2,000. . . . Almost without exception during the entire period since the 1953-54 recession the unemployment gap between white and non-white has been greater than before 1954. During the past three years the non-white unemployment rate has been almost consistently more than double the white unemployment rate. (*New York Times*, July 11, 1958.)

These hard facts, however, have yet to strike home. They have done little to change the limited approach to Negro emancipation adopted by the liberal Negro leadership in the NAACP. This leadership still believes that capitalist America will some day come to its senses and emancipate the Negro masses. But the fact remains that capitalist America will never emancipate the Negro, and will forever drag its feet in its sham efforts to uproot racist practices and institutions. American capitalism thrives upon disunity among the Negro and white masses, and as long as racism facilitates this disunity there is no hope of capitalist America uprooting it. I am sure that Negro leadership recognizes the meaning of Frederick Douglass' statement that "He who would be free must strike the first blow." But it fails to recognize the important question of where to strike the first blow. Toward which "Wall" should the trumpet blast?

III

This leads me to one final aspect of Anne Braden's book. Throughout the book one feels a deep pleasure in Anne Braden's personal struggle against the racist doctrine which was instilled in her from childhood. The account of her break with her racist up-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bringing is itself a story of great and noble moment. Such an experience on the part of a white American born and bred in the South is clearly no small matter. And Anne Braden has great faith in the capacity of other Southern whites to undergo a similar human metamorphosis. With this change, she calls for a concerted effort by progressive whites in the South to build a bridge across the wall that Southern whites have erected between themselves and the Negro people. She finds in this the way to the achievement of a new era in human relations in the American South.

Although I can agree with Anne Braden's approach as far as it goes, I feel it in no way goes far enough. She neglects the important and necessary role of the American government. The activity of progressive-minded Southern whites is well and good, but it is not enough in itself. A government in Washington determined to take firm action against the disgusting treatment of Negroes would make Anne Braden's approach far more meaningful.

I recognize the political and other issues involved in bringing such a government to power in this country. Such a government would have to be either socialist or at least of a progressive New Deal character. This is so because Negro emancipation involves not only the enactment of legislation outlawing, on penalty of certain criminal conviction, all acts of unequal treatment and violence toward Negroes, but also the enactment of legislation to protect and facilitate the organization of white and Negro workers in the South for their mutual benefit.*

The foregoing conditions for a new race relations in the South and for Negro emancipation generally, do not rule out the usefulness of Anne Braden's approach. But without them there is little hope for Negro emancipation within the next fifty years. Nevertheless, Anne Braden's book gives us a new and much needed faith in the funda-

* Harvey Swados has recently reported on the use of racism to prevent trade union organization in the South: "Today, throughout the South, thousands of men and women who work in textile mills at below-standard wages, in below-standard conditions, vote against unions because they are showered with racist propaganda of the lowest kind. Take the case of the Burlington Chain. Burlington is the largest single textile company in the United States, employing about 50,000 workers in about a hundred plants in this country alone. This is no backwoods outfit. It is also not above being involved in the distribution of anti-Semitic and anti-Negro propaganda, in having its supervisors tell employees that the union is 100 per cent for racial integration, in having its plant managers tell employees that the union has given large sums to the NAACP, in informing its employees that white workers would have Negro stewards if the union got in." ("Myth of the Powerful Worker," *The Nation,* July 5, 1958.)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mental decency remaining in some of our countrymen. And since such decency is hard to come by these days, it is most heartening to know that some is still around. To Anne Braden, and also to her husband Carl, all decent Americans will forever be deeply in debt.

FROM THE NEGRO PRESS

Anne Braden's book belongs on one's bookshelf between Zola's *J'Accuse* and John Hersey's *The Wall.*

It is as heartrending a book as any true account of catastrophic human failure—moral and spiritual—must be; and it is as compassionate a book as a sympathetic understanding of human weakness can make it.

Though Anne Braden had every excuse to write an angry and despairing book, she did not.

And this is all to the good, for anger is not nearly so effective as compassion, and screams can drown out the quiet voice of reason and the steadfast voice of right. It is reason and right for which the author pleads. . . .

—Saunders Redding, *Afro-American Newspapers*

. . . It is the first time the feelings, thoughts and subsequent actions of members of both races have been described so clearly.

—Albert Anderson, *Associated Negro Press*

. . . Negroes do not need to read this book except to see how well a young Southern white woman has come to know THEM. But Negroes should put it into the hands of Southern and Northern whites. The Eastlands won't like this book, but they can't laugh it off. The white ministry of the South will be disturbed by this book, so it ought to be sent to white ministers. The White House should receive several copies. All members of the Civil Rights Commission should read it. Attorney General William P. Rogers and that master moralist, Foster Dulles, should also read this confession of America's greatest sin.

—P. L. Prattis, *The Pittsburgh Courier,* July 19, 1958

. . . a must for those persons concerned about race relations . . . told in such a straightforward and convincing manner that even Governor Faubus could comprehend were he to read it.

—Jimmy Stewart, *The Black Dispatch,* June 20, 1958

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Do you believe in your right to live?
in humanity's right to survive?

Do you want to help free the world from
"The agony of international conflict
and the fear of annihilation"?

Then read . . .

TO END NUCLEAR BOMB TESTS

A New Pamphlet By

CORLISS and MARGARET LAMONT

The story of one couple's vigorous protest against bomb testing and of what groups throughout America and the world are doing in the cause of nuclear disarmament and peace.

Single copy 10c 7 copies 50c 15 copies $1
50 copies or more, 40% discount

BASIC PAMPHLETS, Dept. MR
Box 42, Cathedral Station, New York 25, N. Y.

MR Press Pamphlets

WHY SOCIALISM? by Albert Einstein
15c per copy 7 for $1 40 for $5

THE ABC OF SOCIALISM
by Leo Huberman and Sybil H. May
50c per copy 5 for $2 13 for $5

ON SEGREGATION
by Leo Huberman and Paul M. Sweezy
25c per copy 5 for $1 30 for $5

MARXIAN SOCIALISM
POWER ELITE OR RULING CLASS?
by Paul M. Sweezy
25c per copy 5 for $1 30 for $5

Send your order, with payment enclosed, to

Monthly Review 66 Barrow Street New York 14, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*continued from inside front cover*)

publishers shy away from printing works on any subject of a controversial nature. You have done the nation a signal service in bringing Anne Braden's book to the public.

Ed Snow, author of the classic *Red Star Over China,* whose new book *Journey to the Beginning* will soon be published by Random House, writes us that he found the Braden book "absorbing reading and a valuable social and sociological document. I learned a great deal from it. The author's reflections at the close are honest, pertinent, and sincere. It is a pity that the book seems to have been ignored by the 'big time' reviews."

Perhaps the "big time" reviews will still get to the Braden book. But since we can't be certain, won't you help get it the attention it deserves by asking your local library to order it?

In the United States our book on race relations is ignored by the press but in South Africa another one of our books has received a careful going over. The "Government Gazette" there, on July 25, published a list of 154 banned books. MR Press book *The South African Treason Trial* by Forman and Sachs, is on the list.

On his return from the Middle East Harvey O'Connor informed us that copies of the English edition of his book *The Empire of Oil,* long out of print here, might be obtained from the English publisher. We inquired at once and managed to get 50 copies. Eight have already been used to fill back orders. First come, first served on the remaining 42 copies. Send $5 with your order (or $7 for the book plus a renewal of your sub).

Dr. Cheddi Jagan, head of the government of British Guiana, asks that we urge our readers to send their unwanted back issues of MR to the library of the People's Progressive Party. Address: Janet Jagan, c/o People's Progressive Party, 73 Wellington Street, Georgetown, British Guiana.

Final notice: the deadline for entries for our Essay Contest (MR, May 1958) is September 15. That reminds us—we saw a significant story in the *New York Times* of May 14 about 12-year-old William H. Lipton, seventh-grader in a Brooklyn, N. Y. Junior High School whose first published story won a prize in a children's magazine. The Times reports:

> Billy thinks that he has inherited the writing talent of his father, Norman C. Lipton, a public relations man. His ambition is to be a writer "and to make a million dollars while I'm still in my 20's." The most important things in life, he says are "money, food, girls, television, and the comics."

Each year, in September, Monthly Review Associates send out their annual appeal letter. Last year, and the year before, 23.3 percent of our total income came from contributions to the Associates appeal. Without this financial aid, MR would have to fold. One out of every five subscribers joins the Associates. If you haven't joined before, we hope you will this year. We need your help. See the back cover for details—and note that if you become a Supporting Associate or better ($15 or more) you will receive, FREE, a copy of *The Wall Between* (or any other MR Press book of your choice).

Announcement: Social Science Institute, Harborside, Maine, announces the publication, on November 15, of *The Brave New World* by Helen and Scott Nearing. The book reports the Nearings' observations of the Soviet Union and China. It will sell for $3.50 and will be off the press end of September. In combination with the Nearings' *Socialists Around the World* ($3) it will sell at the prepublication price of $5, a saving of $1.50. Order *The Brave New World* by itself or in combination with *Socialists Around the World* from Social Science Institute.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MONTHLY REVIEW *Associates*

invites you to renew your subscription to MR automatically, and at the same time:

- help support the magazine and extend its influence as one of the few remaining voices of progress
- attend, free of charge, all MR Associates lectures
- receive, without cost, all pamphlets published by MR

Whether your subscription expires with the next issue—or not for another year—makes no difference. Joining the Associates now adds a full year to your present subscription.

To

renew your subscription to MR
help MR grow

JOIN NOW

MONTHLY REVIEW ASSOCIATES
66 Barrow Street, New York 14, N. Y.

I enclose ..... dollars. Please enroll me as an MR Associate.

Check category (annual) below.

☐	$ 8 - $14	Contributing Associate
☐	$ 15 - $49	Supporting Associate
☐	$ 50 - $99	Sustaining Associate
☐	$100 and over	Foundation Associate

Note: A copy of "The Wall Between" by Anne Braden (or any other MR Press book) will be sent FREE to anyone becoming a Supporting Associate or better ($15 or more).

Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zone ..... State .....

Please make your check payable to Monthly Review Associates

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED